The Future of New Testament Textual Scholarship

From H. C. Hoskier to the Editio Critica Maior and Beyond

Edited by

Garrick V. Allen

Mohr Siebeck

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Garrick V. Allen, born 1988; 2015 PhD; Lecturer in New Testament Studies at Dublin City University, Republic of Ireland.
orcid.org/0000-0003-4428-1775

ISBN 978-3-16-156662-2 / 978-3-16-156663-9
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156663-9

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2019 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Table of Contents

Preface IX

Intellectual History of Textual Scholarship

Garrick V. Allen
The Patient Collator and the Philology of the Beyond:
H. C. Hoskier and the New Testament 3

Juan Hernández Jr.
Hoskier's Contribution to the Apocalypse's Textual History:
Collations, Polyglots, Groupings 39

Martin Karrer
Herman Charles Hoskier and the Textual Criticism of Revelation 51

Jan Krans
Hoskier in the Spiritual World 69

Jennifer Wright Knust
On Textual Nostalgia: Herman C. Hoskier's Collation of Evangelium 604
(London, British Library Egerton 2610; GA 700) Revisited 79

Peter J. Gurry
'A Book Worth Publishing': The Making of Westcott and Hort's
Greek New Testament (1881) 103

The Status Quaestionis and Future of Textual Scholarship

Stanley E. Porter
The Domains of Textual Criticism and the Future of Textual Scholarship 131

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Gregory Peter Fewster
Finding Your Place: Developing Cross-reference Systems
in Late Antique Biblical Codices 155

Christina M. Kreinecker
Papyrology, Papyrological Commentary, and the Future
of New Testament Textual Scholarship 181

Jacob W. Peterson
Patterns of Correction as Paratext: A New Approach with Papyrus 46
as a Test Case 201

Dirk Jongkind
Redactional Elements in the Text of Codex B 231

H. A. G. Houghton
The Garland of Howth (Vetus Latina 28): A Neglected Old Latin
Witness in Matthew 247

Curt Niccum
Hoskier and His (Per)Version of the Ethiopic 265

Thomas J. Kraus
Ostraca and Talismans: The Story of Two Former Text-Critical
Categories and What to do with Them Today 283

An-Ting Yi
The Critical Apparatus of Stephanus' Greek New Testament of 1550:
Early Printed Editions and Textual Scholarship 305

Tommy Wasserman
Methods of Evaluating Textual Relationships: From Bengel
to the CBGM and Beyond 333

J. K. Elliott
Thoroughgoing Eclectic Textual Criticism: Manuscripts and Variants
of Revelation 363

Jill Unkel
Speaking in Tongues: Collecting the Chester Beatty Biblical Manuscripts ... 379

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Editing the New Testament in a Digital Age

D. C. Parker
The Future of the Critical Edition 395

Catherine Smith
Old Wine, New Wineskins: Digital Tools for Editing the New Testament.... 407

Klaus Wachtel
The Development of the Coherence-Based Genealogical
Method (CBGM), its Place in Textual Scholarship, and Digital Editing 435

Annette Hüffmeier
Apparatus Construction: Philological Methodology
and Technical Realization..... 447

Contributors 461

Bibliography 463

Ancient Sources Index..... 503

Modern Author Index..... 513

Subject Index 521

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

The Patient Collator and the Philology of the Beyond: H. C. Hoskier and the New Testament

Garrick V. Allen

The shared goal of this volume is to explore the developing fault lines in text-critical and editorial praxis that pervade the discipline of New Testament studies. These changes in the field are as multifaceted as the reasons for their manifestation, wrought by fundamental transformations in media, changes in theological attitudes toward the wording of the New Testament, re-evaluations of the significance of the history of the tradition, and many other factors. The work of Herman Charles Elias Hoskier (1864–1938), who published under the name H. C. Hoskier but was called Charles by friends, was selected as the lens through which to analyse changing trends in research because Hoskier himself was a transitional figure who was active precisely a century ago. This article unpacks this decision by examining the eccentricities of Hoskier's life, work, and his contribution to textual scholarship on the New Testament. Hoskier provides a model, sometimes a cautionary one, for grappling with substantial disciplinary instability and for personal dedication to a sometimes thankless vocation, both of which are recurring themes in his body of work. I conclude the discussion with a complete and extended annotated bibliography of Hoskier's publications, because many (if not all) of his books and articles are out of print and difficult to locate, and because the foibles of his individual outputs are explained, at least in part, when his broader body of work is taken as a whole. The discussion that follows is my justification for selecting Hoskier as an interlocutor for this volume, even though his milieu was populated by many other more distinguished individuals and more adept analytical minds. Hoskier keeps a volume like this from becoming nakedly hagiographic.

Hoskier's transitional status is firstly represented in the contours of his biography.[1] He lived and produced his scholarship in a period defined by change and upheaval. Born in Blackheath, Kent to a prominent merchant banker, Hoskier is much less renowned than his father (also called Herman Hoskier), who made his name shipping cotton past the Union blockade at the outset of

[1] For a fuller biographical treatment, cf. Garrick V. Allen, "'There is No Glory and No Money in the Work': H. C. Hoskier and New Testament Textual Criticism," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 23 (2018): 1–19.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

the American civil war in 1859, as the head of the largest bank in the world (the Union Bank of London in 1881), and as the financial director of Arthur Guinness Son & Co. Brewery from 1886. We are still able to enjoy a pint of Guinness today, in part, because of the labours of Hoskier's father. Hoskier benefitted from his father's prominence, earning a place at Eton College (1878–1881) – although perhaps "earning" is not the right word here in this culture of privilege – and a healthy inheritance, equivalent to nearly $28 million in current terms.[2]

Hoskier took his father's connections and financial backing to Gilded Age Manhattan in the mid-1880s, settling in the East Egg enclave of South Orange, New Jersey and marrying Amelia Wood in a heralded ceremony graced by many a titan of finance in 1888. Following what was by all accounts a successful career in brokerage and finance for the firms Hoskier, Wood & Co. and the L. von Hoffmann & Co., he retired in 1903 to the lucrative career of textual criticism. He briefly returned to finance to co-chair J. P. Morgan's short-lived Foreign Finance Corporation – a precursor to the World Bank – following the First World War. Although he published his first book *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604* in 1890, he lamented the lack of relaxation available to him in his career as a financier, even though he was also a noted man of leisure, collecting numismatics, incunabula, manuscripts, *objets d'art*, and horses.[3] Hoskier valued intellectual pursuits over and above financial gain and security, rejecting the dominant ethos of übercapitalist late-nineteenth century New York. A career change at the age of thirty-nine marks the first major transition in Hoskier's life. He never held an academic post, but appears to have lived off the wealth that he had amassed as inheritor and financier.

The level of Hoskier's idealist commitment to his personal convictions is also on display in his participation in what I suspect is the defining event in his life: the First World War. After producing a number of publications from 1910–1914, Hoskier's bibliography has a five-year gap that reflects his volunteer service in an American detachment of the French Ambulance corp. He saw combat, was twice wounded on the Western front (injuries that slowed his rigorous scholarly work), awarded the Croix de Guerre, and made member of the Legion of Honour. His volunteer service was motivated by his family background on one hand – he had deep connections to France (his uncle Emile

[2] £211,027 7s. 6d. according to John Orbell, "Hoskier, Herman," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004) (https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/49026) [accessed 19 February 2018].

[3] Hoskier's financial issues famously led to the selling of some of his collections. Cf. *A Catalogue of a Portion of the Valuable Library of H. C. Hoskier, Esq. of South Orange, New Jersey, U.S.A.* (London: Sotheby, 1908) and *Auctions-catalog einer höchst bedeutenden Sammlung Griechischer und Römischer Münzen, Collection H. C. Hoskier* (Munich: Hirsch, 1907).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Hoskier was a prominent French banker, for example) and boasted Serbian heritage – and by his son's own zeal for the justice of the Allies' cause on the other.[4] Ronald Wood Hoskier, Hoskier's son and a student at Harvard, was the first American fighter pilot to perish in the war. He served in the *Escadrille de La Fayette* and was shot down over San Quentin on 23 April 1917.[5] Both Hoskier and his family continued to advocate for the victims of the war long after its conclusion.[6]

Following the war, Hoskier resumed his text-critical work. Closely aligned with Henry A. Sanders of the University of Michigan, as well as other prominent scholars like J. Rendel Harris with whom he left a voluminous correspondence,[7] Hoskier donated much of his library, manuscripts, and coins to the University of Michigan library, benevolence that earned him an honorary Master of Arts in 1925 and an appointment as Honorary Curator of the University's Museum of Archaeology (1929).[8] He only accepted the latter position after receiving assurances that it required no actual work. He moved from New Jersey

---

[4] Cf. the introduction in *Literary Fragments of Ronald Wood Hoskier 1896–1917* (Boston: McKenzie, n.d.), 5–8, which I suspect was edited by H. C. Hoskier, although the editor is anonymous and it bears no date. The copy that I have consulted was donated by H. C. Hoskier himself to the University of Michigan Library.

[5] Cf. "American Flier Killed in Combat," New York Times, 25 April 1917.

[6] Amelia Wood Hoskier, for example, wrote a letter to the editor of The New York Times that was published on 8 February 1926, advocating for French Refugees.

[7] Hoskier carried on a long-lasting and rather intimate correspondence with Harris touching on a range of issues, including Harris' survival of a German torpedoing off Corsica, Hoskier's experience at the Western front, text-critical concerns, and serious interest in spiritualism, although it is not clear that Harris reciprocated this interest (Hoskier refers to Harris' "discreet silence" on the matter, which to me indicates that Harris was more interested in the text-critical aspects of their conversation, Birmingham Library DA21/1/2/1/25/7, 17 May 1922). Among Hoskier's correspondence with Harris exists a short work by Hoskier, unpublished, reflecting on his appreciation of Patience Worth, a supposed spirit of a seventeenth century woman in a long-term communication with a Mrs Curran of St. Louis (*Appreciation of "P.W." by an Outsider*, signed H.C.H.), along with a copy of a book composed by Patience through the medium Mrs Curran (DA21/1/2/1/25/3, 19 December 1921). The earliest letter to Harris (7 May 1917) is characteristic of Hoskier idiosyncrasies, discussing Harris' "escape of the Boche torpedoes," the death of his son in a dogfight, sarcastic thoughts on the news that C. R. Gregory was a German lieutenant on the Western front, and hope that pro-German academics in Great Britain would "see the light" (DA21/1/2/1/25/1). Harris also uses Hoskier as a sounding board for expensive purchases of manuscripts, which Hoskier at times offers to fund on his behalf (DA21/1/2/1/25/4, 20 January 1922). Hoskier also informs Harris that he has met Patience in person, since the family that received the spirit communication named an adopted child after the spirit (DA21/1/2/1/25/6, 22 April 1922). Their letters are not always entirely friendly in tone (e.g. DA21/1/2/1/25/15, 25 March 1928).

[8] The British Museum was also a benefactor of Hoskier's donations. Cf. H. R. Hall, "Other Donations to the Egyptian and Assyrian Department," *The British Museum Quarterly* 5/2 (1930): 48–9.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

to Jersey in the Channel Islands in 1927, where he travelled frequently to France. In June 1938, three months before his death on 8 September, Hoskier was awarded an honorary ThD from the Universiteit van Amsterdam. Amendments to his will after his wife's death in 1929 (amended 2 August 1935) indicate his poor financial state. He requests not to be transported to his family plot in South Orange, but to be buried in a simple box on Jersey. He also notes that his son Walter in fact owes him £359 and that this amount should be deducted from his inheritance should there be any. Not to dissuade potential PhD students, but Hoskier is proof that one rarely gets rich on textual scholarship.[9]

The many significant transitions of Hoskier's life are deeply connected to his body of academic and philosophical work. The primary aim of Hoskier's activities was, even to the end of his life, to reclaim the value of the *Textus Receptus* that Westcott and Hort had dethroned decisively, with much assistance from distinguished predecessors, in Anglophone scholarship in 1881. Hort's introduction in particular satisfied Hoskier's need for a foil, even though he adopted many of the presuppositions that stand behind Westcott and Hort's method, including the idea that textual criticism properly done can fully and securely recover the "original" or "true" text of the New Testament, that scribal proclivities were always aimed toward the mechanical reproduction of texts, especially sacred ones, and that the goal of editorial work was the identification and removal of accreted errors.[10]

Hoskier is often identified, and therefore dismissed, with John William Burgon (1813–1888), the indefatigable champion of all things traditional, who, in addition to being a thoroughgoing polemicist and righteous supporter of the *Textus Receptus* and the authenticity of the long ending of Mark, fought to keep women out of Oxford and considered changing student housing policies since some residences employed women who had previously been incarcerated. The introduction to Hoskier's *Greek Cursive Evangelium 604* (1890) reinforces his connection to Burgon, since it contains an anecdote that opens at midnight with Burgon on the staircase of his Chichester home, recounting his assertion that "as certainly as the sun will rise to-morrow morning, so surely will the traditional text be vindicated."[11] Burgon and his acolytes perceived the paradigm-

[9] In a letter to J. Rendel Harris, Hoskier notes that "I have completely ruined myself in Jersey & would accept a few old piece of furniture from the manor" (DA/21/1/2/1/25/22, 14 March 1929).

[10] Cf. B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, eds., *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882), 1–3, 6–7, 24–30. Although Hort in particular served as Hoskier's nemesis, he could also have benefitted from the example of Westcott and Hort's partnership, which they describe thusly: "No individual mind can ever act with perfect uniformity, or free itself completely from its own idiosyncrasies: the danger of unconscious caprice is inseparable from personal judgement" (here 17).

[11] H. C. Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604* (*with two facsimiles*) (London: David Nutt, 1890), v. Hoskier is also referred to as a "scion

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

shifting edition of Westcott and Hort and its influence on the Revised Version as outright assaults on orthodoxy, tradition, and divine inspiration, often responding as combatants in a holy war.[12] Traces of this influence are felt in Hoskier's pre-war writings, but Hoskier never considered himself one of Burgon's followers, although they did share some critical goals and suppositions.

The transitional nature of Hoskier's project is on full and clear display in the ways that Hoskier breaks from Burgon, especially in his changing rhetorical strategies for vindicating the *Textus Receptus*. Hoskier's academic work can be divided into pre and post-war epochs; the former defined by polemical attempts to vindicate the *Textus Receptus* through rigorous textual data and invective prose, and the latter characterised by methodological devotion to digesting the totality of the evidence, although the polemical edge of his rhetoric never entirely dissipated. The war changed the tenor and tenacity of Hoskier's project; it is no accident that his work that has endured was produced after the war.

The obvious pinnacle of Hoskier's pre-war rhetoric is found in the two-volume *Codex B and its Allies: A Study and an Indictment* (1914),[13] which constitutes an attempt to undermine Codex Vaticanus as a witness to Hort's neutral text, as well as Hort's methodological principles.[14] The critique fails in its

---

of the Burgon school" in a review of Henry A. Sanders' *New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, in *The Biblical World* 42 (1913): 59–69 (here 59) by a certain A. D. Nonetheless, the relationship between Hoskier and Burgon is not so clear-cut, and although Hoskier continued to hold affinities for Burgon's quest to justify the *Textus Receptus*, there is no evidence that he did so out of allegiance to Burgon, even though he did have personal knowledge of Burgon's library, noted in a letter to J. Rendel Harris (DA 21/1/2/1/25/2, 6 October 1920). Cf. Daniel B. Wallace, "Historical Revisionism and the Majority Text Theory: The Cases of F. H. A. Scrivener and Herman C. Hoskier," *NTS* 41 (1995): 280–85: "neither Scrivener nor Hoskier followed in Burgon's steps" (here 281). See also the introduction to Annette Hüffmeier's article and also both Tommy Wasserman and Jennifer Knust's articles in this volume.

[12] Cf. *The Oxford Debates on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: George Bell, 1897) and John William Burgon, *The Revision Revised: Three Articles Reprinted from the Quarterly Review* (London: John Murray: 1883).

[13] *Codex B and its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914).

[14] Westcott and Hort's method for evaluating witnesses led to an extremely high valuation of readings that belonged to a document that they felt was usually correct, especially if it was ancient, aesthetically beautiful, and in uncial script. Cf. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, 10–11, 30–9, 60–2, 232 especially the section on "Internal Evidence of Documents" and "Internal Evidence of Groups," where the valuation of the overarching textual character of a particular witness or group of witnesses, evaluated partially by genealogical reconstruction can at times override intrinsic and transcription probability. A large portion of Hort's introduction (93–179) is devoted to establishing the hierarchical relationships between his main (and ancient) textual families, the neutral, Alexandrian (α), Western (β), and Syrian (δ), of which the neutral text is clearly the group that takes priority, due to the

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

virulence and lack of structure. The first pages, enveloped in legal language of indictment and accusation, aim to prick "the bubble of codex B," and lay "hundreds of separate accounts" (apparently on a reading by reading basis) against Westcott and Hort.[15] The conflict is personal, as Hoskier's confrontation of Alexander Souter – on the first page of the preface! – demonstrates. He notes that despite a negative review of his *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T.* (1910), Souter

> ended up expressing gratitude for my collations…but added some very strong advice to hold my tongue as regarded commenting on the evidence so painfully accumulated…I refuse to be bound by such advice. I demand a fair hearing on a subject very near my heart, and with which by close attention for many years I have tried to make myself sufficiently acquainted to be able and qualified to discuss it with those few who have pursed a parallel course of study.[16]

Hoskier never got his "fair hearing," due in large part to the *ad hominem* and almost panicked nature of his discourse. If Edgar J. Goodspeed described Hoskier's earlier two volumes on the versions as "a mass of individual textual notes, with an occasional paragraph of bold generalization,"[17] then the same can easily be made of *Codex B and its Allies*. And the work is indeed just so: a series of collations designed to undermine the text of Codex B as a legitimate witness of the "true text" and support some other of Hoskier's idiosyncratic pet theories, like the deep antiquity of the versions and the idea that Mark was initially composed in both Latin and Greek simultaneously.

In contrast, the *modus operandi* of Hoskier's work changed fundamentally following the war in a way that still animates text-critical projects like the *Editio Critica Maior* that emphasise comprehensiveness. From 1919 until his death in 1938, Hoskier retained an interest in editing Greek and Latin manuscripts that he perceived to preserve especially important texts, like *The Text of Codex Usserianus 2., or r2 ("Garland of Howth")* (1919) and *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse* (1928), or other traditions that he found interesting, like *De Contemptu Mundi: A Bitter Satirical Poem of 3000 Lines upon the Morals of the XIIth Century by Bernard of Morval Monk of Cluny* (1929). But a larger overarching project, centred on the New Testament Apocalypse took pride of place in his trajectory, and it remains the most

---

periphrastic and interpolatory nature of some Western readings and the conflate nature of a number of Syrian readings, not to mention the fact that, according to Hort, the Alexandrian grammatical schools would have kept "a more than usual watchfulness over the transcription of the writings of the apostles" (p. 127). Codex B is Hort's preeminent witness to the pre-Syrian neutral text (pp. 150–51, 170–72, 210, 220–60).

[15] *Codex B*, 1.i.

[16] *Codex B*, 1.i.

[17] Edgar. J. Goodspeed, "Review: Hoskier's Study of the New Testament Versions," *AJT* 16 (1912): 652–54 (here 653).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

important aspect of his body of work. Although he published a number of studies on Revelation, including a five-article series in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (1922–1924), his two-volume magnum opus *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (1929) represents a herculean individual effort to compile a master collation of every known witness of the book of Revelation in an edition organized around the 1550 Stephanus text. Polemical interjections remain essential to the fabric of Hoskier's discourse in the post-war period, but methodological principles of patience and data aggregation replace pure textual rhetoric. Hoskier never achieved Lachmannian "scientific" proof of the "originality" of the *Textus Receptus* for the Apocalypse – his underlying and sometimes stated goal – but he did provide a valuable resource for textual scholarship that accurately supplements hand editions of the New Testament and provides access to now-lost artefacts and their texts (e.g. GA 241, Hoskier 47). *Concerning the Text* did not rescue the *Textus Receptus*, but undermined it further by clearly demonstrating the fundamental uncertainty of many places in the tradition and the peculiarities of many individual witnesses.

The methodological purity of Hoskier's post-war programme continues to inform textual criticism on the New Testament, which is now grappling with basic changes in media, digital infrastructure, and the requirements of funding bodies, even if his influence remains primarily subconscious. The production of collaborative digital workspaces and electronic transcriptions is now making it possible for editors and scholars to once again build comprehensive sets of data for New Testament works beyond Revelation.[18] Hoskier too, utilised technological innovations to produce his lasting contribution. Using his once vast personal financial resources, he purchased photographs of manuscripts from far-flung libraries and personal collections, plying the improvements in the cost of photographic technology in the early twentieth century to his advantage, while at the same time complaining about the prices that libraries charged for reproductions. Continuing changes in modern text-critical praxis are enabled by technological changes in the field, like the burgeoning archives of quality digital images, published transcripts, and digital editions. Although his project ultimately failed in its stated goals, Hoskier's working method and reliance on modern technology anticipated more sophisticated modes of research, many of which are visible in the work of the contributors to this volume.

[18] The *Editio Critica Maior* of Revelation is currently in production at the Institut für Septuaginta- und biblische Textforschung at the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel under the supervision of Martin Karrer. Cf. Marcus Sigismund, "Die neue Edition der Johannespokalypse: Stand der Arbeit," in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ANTF 50, ed. M. Sigismund and D. Müller (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 3–17, and Darius Müller, "Zur elektronischen Transkription von Apokalypsehandschriften: Bericht zum Arbeitsstand," 19–30 in the same volume.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

The final piece of evidence for the transitional nature of Hoskier's complex life is the series of philosophical treatises that he authored in the late 1920s and 1930s. As the flustered polemics of *Codex B and its Allies* demonstrates, pre-war Hoskier is motivated by an explicit desire to uphold what he perceived as orthodox Christian adherence to a traditional text form of the New Testament. However, following the war marked by his own service and the tragic death of his son, the apologetic strain in his academic writings ebbs and a moral call for humanity to realise its own essential deific essence gains prominence in these writings. His philosophy is important because it is never entirely divorced from his academic work, as Jan Krans' article in this volume incisively demonstrates. Hoskier appeals to mediums and spirit guides to enforce his textual decisions and even includes readings created by a spirit at a nineteenth century séance. He also comments in a copy of a letter sent to J. Rendel Harris that he is "in slight touch himself with the other side."[19]

These moves are undergirded by his philosophic ideals, laid out in his panentheistic treatises that were part of a much larger re-enchantment of the world known as theosophy, a movement that garnered a significant amount of popular interest after the war in Europe, even though its origins can be traced to the early nineteenth century. Two of these works were written under the appropriately esoteric pseudonym Signpost.[20] Although these writings, at times, are prescient in their suggestion that the world was hurtling toward another major conflict, the prose is often as incohesive and its message is incoherent.[21] In his self-proclaimed creed in the form of a prayer, *What is Nirvana?*, Hoskier builds his case using familiar Christian language. For example:

> And so, Great Father – see, I dare to call Thee Father – taught by Him of lowly Nazareth, – Thine Angel-Messenger, – Gabriel, God-man – I bow my head I bow my knees, I bow my

[19] Copy of a letter to Mrs Curran 1 December 1921 (DA/21/1/2/1/25/3). When D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 231 asks "was he [Hoskier] serious" about including readings from spirit communications in the apparatus of *Concerning the Text*, the answer must undoubtedly be affirmative.

[20] H. C. Hoskier, *In Tune with the Universe* (London: Rider & Co., 1932) and Hoskier, *The Back of Beyond* (London: C. W. Daniel, 1934), although Hoskier wrote the preface for *In Tune with the Universe* in his own name (in which he declares that "Signpost has lifted a corner of the veil by his differentiation between the vibrational world and the non-vibrational"), and although H. C. Hoskier is included on the title page of *The Back of Beyond*.

[21] See for example, Hoskier's comments on Japan in 1930: "If I turn my eyes to Nippon, I am but bewildered. Is the backwater of to-day but the maelstrom of to-morrow? Who knows?" (*'The Bronze Hoses': A Comment on the Prose-Poem of Amy Lowell* [Portland, ME: Mosher Press, 1930], 14). This appraisal is commensurate with his pessimistic appraisal of nation states at this time (pp. 13–8). In *In Tune*, 120–21 Hoskier also calls for a body like the United Nations. Cf. also *Back of Beyond*, 62–70.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

dust-clad spirit and acknowledge Thee: All-Good, All-Wise, All-Just, All-True, All-Pure, to be…….Me……..And I……Thee.[22]

Hoskier contends that all that exists is really one living eternal organism and that human conflict of all forms is inimical to the all-encompassing "All-Life." The goal of human activity, according to his theosophonic philosophy, is to transcend the "vibrational world of effects" to what he calls the "back of beyond" or the "world of Causes lying behind it,"[23] a place accessible by looking inside oneself in an effort to locate one's own "godhood" where we find "our coequality with that Essence."[24] Ultimately, for Hoskier, once we realise that we are "essentially deific," we are free to escape to the world of ultimate causes;[25] since all are one and one are all, death has no significance and organized religion is a false path to "Wholeness."[26] This is borne out also by his burial wishes recorded in his will:

> I declare that I die in the certainty of the continuity of life both molecular and spiritual; attached to no particular school of thought nor to any particular religion, but in love with all man's striving towards the recognition of his birthright as part of an indivisible All-life, which in reality constitutes the Whole, so that he cannot 'die' in any sense whatever.

Many have scoffed at Hoskier's naïveté for believing in spirits and theosophy and have thereby written-off his contribution to the discipline. But it is important to remember that his interest in the occult was shared by many, especially following the rebirth of theosophy in Europe after the trauma of the war. These aspects of Hoskier's work are not disqualifying, but instead further illuminate his context and influences.

The persistence of resolve found in some corners of Hoskier's scholarship are identifiable also in his life. There is no division for him between academic work and the working out of the complexities of life and the ultimate fate of humanity. In this sense, Hoskier views textual scholarship as essential to understanding the world and as a basic foundation for life. It is more than academic tedium and even more than an essential preliminary task necessary for interpretation; it is not just an essential discipline in the humanities, but an essential discipline for humanity, whether or not we agree with his philosophical proclivities. The detail-oriented rigor and persistence required for textual criticism were characteristics that Hoskier perceived as essential to living. Textual scholarship mirrors life, and textual rhetoric is the language of science. Despite his idiosyncrasies and foibles, all textual scholars can see parts of themselves in Hoskier's principled integrity and earnestness of conscience,

---

[22] H. C. Hoskier, *What is Nirvana?* (Portland, ME: Mosher Press, 1930), 12.

[23] E.g. *In Tune*, 1.

[24] "You don't look up, but you look within." "No longer Three in One, but All in One, and we are not only of it or a part of it, but It Itself" (*In Tune*, 5, 7); cf. *Back of Beyond*, 21.

[25] Cf. *Back of Beyond*, 41–5 on how to accomplish this task, according to Hoskier.

[26] *Back of Beyond*, 28–9, 53–7, 70–82.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

even if we ultimately exclude spirit communications from our apparatuses and decide to keep our philological efforts to this side of the Back of Beyond.

The many transitions in Hoskier's life and work coalesce to mark him as a transitional figure in textual scholarship on the New Testament. He stands between the Lachmannian sensibilities of the nineteenth century and the radical insecurity of textual traditions and editorial decision that defined some quarters of editorial work in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.[27] A basic tension of his medial position is his insistence in many publications that one must first gather *all* data before making any interpretations or judgments, even though he has an obvious agenda and makes interpretive judgements throughout. The contradiction reinforces the concept that, even if one claims otherwise, all textual scholarship is interpretive, all collation is rhetoric, and every manuscript has a voice as a legitimate witness to the tradition. Hoskier could not have admitted this, but his method and body of work speaks plainly. This is precisely why using him as a frame to re-imagine the discipline of New Testament textual scholarship is both legitimate and right. He is not the most famous or decorated scholar of his generation; he never held an academic post, earned a university degree, relieved a funding body of its reserves, had a PhD student, won any awards, or sold many books – many of the copies of his books that I have examined at different European libraries were in fact donated by him personally to these institutions. But he created the space through his methodological emphases for important projects and trends in the field that are finally being realised today. Hoskier provides space to imagine what we do not yet know – to think about how the choices made by scholars and editors today will change the discipline in the future.

[27] Cf. Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, trans. G. W. Most (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), esp. 84–9, 119–38, sections that enlighten Hoskier's intellectual context, his simultaneous radical departures from it, and his unknowing accession to his own time.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Annotated Bibliography[28]

A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604 (*with two facsimiles*). London: David Nutt, 1890.[29]

Hoskier's first book is both misleading and instructive for understanding his larger body of work. The preface opens with an anecdote of a conversation with John William Burgon about the vindication of the *Textus Receptus* and the book is fawningly dedicated to Burgon.[30] However, as I mentioned above, the relationship between Hoskier's work and Burgon is complicated, and although Burgon is the better rhetor, Hoskier is the more creative scholar. The book is instructive insofar as it introduces Hoskier's dominant mode of discourse (collation and textual notes) and an early insight into his larger, but developing project (the scientific vindication of the *Textus Receptus*, against Hort [cf. pp. cxv–cxvi], through study of the text of neglected New Testament manuscripts). The main argument that the evidence in the book is designed to support is that the text of the fourth and fifth century uncials is corrupt, a point

[28] Hoskier is also credited with another book that is not included in this bibliography because it is comprised of tables of calculations for identifying the prices of securities in arbitrage sales between the New York and London stock exchanges. H. C. Hoskier, *Table of Arbitrage Parities between New York and London* (London: Richard Clay and Sons, 1892). This volume has nothing to do with textual scholarship, but it does demonstrate Hoskier's interest in careful data aggregation, and this type of work appears to be the equivalent of textual criticism for the financial sector, although I imagine that it is much more lucrative. Another, unpublished article, entitled "Λόγια or the 'Oracles of God' and χορηγία or the Supply of the Spirit by Direct Intervention between God and Man," was sent by Hoskier to J. Rendel Harris on 22 June 1922 (DA21/1/2/1/25/9–10), seeking advice for a publisher. One was not found for this article that, among other things, leans heavily on the comparison of prayer and the new-fangled wireless.

[29] Cf. the positive review of Appendix C of this work in E. Nestle, "Some Points in the History of the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament," *JTS* 9 (1910): 564–68; the criticism in Isaac H. Hall, "The Title-Page of the Elzevir Greek New Testament of 1624," *JBL* 10 (1891): 147–50; and A. Plummer's review in *The Classical Review* 4/10 (1890): 478, who refers to the work as "a labour of love." Wilhelm Bousset, *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, TU 9/4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1894), 118–19 argues that Hoskier refuses to comment on the significance of his data, but Hoskier rebuts that it would be too hasty in *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions*, ix–x. In *Concerning the Text*, 1.xxxviii he retorts again: "This is foolish. We have had too many cheap and hasty deductions from insignificant or insufficient data." Bousset, "Textkritik II," *Theologische Rundschau* 17 (1914): 187–206 (esp. 199–200) also critiques Hoskier. He begins his review thusly: "Ein Textkritiker, der ganz einsam und abseits von den gewöhnlichen Wegen seine Bahnen zieht, ist Hoskier."

[30] See also p. vi: Burgon's "*Magnum Opus*, had he lived to edit it, would have for ever vindicated his reputation, his views, his methods, nay, the very manner of expressing himself, if by a too decided front he had made himself enemies and curtailed the extent of his hearing for a time."

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

reinforced by the continued unearthing of texts that that disagree with them in substantive ways, especially when these new texts are independent in their textual affiliations.

Hoskier goes about this by examining the text of GA 700 and comparing it to readings in earlier uncial witnesses, an appraisal that illustrates to his satisfaction that "the compilers of such [uncial] codices were, to an enormous extent, their own critics, leading them to altogether independent treatment of the Sacred Text" (p. xiv). The age of the manuscript does not guarantee the quality or age of the text (p. xv), and the text of GA 700 is of higher quality than more ancient exemplars. Hoskier comments first on the palaeographic, codicological, and scribal profile of the manuscript, as well as offering corrections to antecedent collations, as he is often wont to do (pp. i–xxviii). This is followed by a list of singular readings, counting 270 in this Gospel manuscript, and a list of readings poorly attested elsewhere without comment (pp. xxix–cxv). The introduction gives way then to the collation of the manuscript *in toto* against Stephanus' 1550 edition (pp. 1–43). The book concludes with ten appendices that describe other manuscripts, correct some of Scrivener's collations, collate various printed editions, contain library reports, and other text-critical concerns.

The book also provides some delightful notes on the importance of collating and careful study of the documents,[31] alongside some invective statements that anticipate the full-blown polemics of *Codex B and its Allies* (e.g. p. xvi). Appendix J – a note on 1 Tim 3:15 – is a reprint of an article Hoskier published in *Clergyman's Magazine* in February 1887.[32] See also Jennifer Knust's article in this volume.

The Golden Latin Gospels: JP in the library of J. Pierpont Morgan (formerly known as the "Hamilton Gospels" and sometimes as King Henry the VIIIth's Gospels) now edited for the first time, with critical introduction and notes, and accompanied by four full-page facsimiles. New York: Private Printing, 1910.[33]

This volume is a sumptuously produced edition and discussion of a seventh or eighth century purple bicolumnar Vulgate manuscript that the famed financier

[31] E.g. p. vi: "Though seemingly dry and laborious work (and of a truth it is the latter to a large extent) some of the most wonderful truths, some of the most interesting problems present themselves to his mind as letter by letter, line by line, and page by page the patient collator toils along slowly at his task." See also p. xxi: "Die grösste Frucht unserer Arbeit ist oft die Arbeit selbst."

[32] Cf. also Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text III* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2012), 71.

[33] Cf. Hoskier's correspondence with Rudyard Kipling in November 1910 on the provenance of the manuscript's scribe in T. Pinney, ed., *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, vol. 3 1900–10 (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 464–66. Cf. reviews by Edgar J. Goodspeed,

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

J. Pierpont Morgan purchased from Hoskier's own dealer and sometimes publisher Bernard Quaritch of London. Only 200 hundred copies were printed in a private printing arranged by Morgan (printed by Frederic Fairchild Sherman), including some colour images of the manuscript printed on the finest Italian paper with interlocking sea horse watermarks that bear the text "FFS Italy." The volume is an artistic work regardless of its contents; the beauty of the printed edition corresponds to the aesthetics of the manuscripts it aims to represent. In his review, Sanders refers to it as "a book-lovers' prize" (p. 218).

The introduction to the volume, however, is as arduous to read as it was onerous to construct. It attempts to localise the production context of the manuscript, which Hoskier locates in the UK or Ireland, even though JP – the siglum he invents for the manuscript – is in "a class by itself as regards English and Irish MSS" (p. xv). The arguments of the volume are twofold: (1) to acknowledge the high value of JP's text (the stemma on p. xcviii emphasises the significant place this witness has in Hoskier's reconstruction of the tradition); and (2) to demonstrate that the Greek uncials were influenced by readings particular to JP and its tradition (e.g. pp. liv–lxvii).[34] Hoskier's overriding polyglot theory takes shape here. The means of making these arguments is through data in the form of extensive collation, which Hoskier makes for each Gospel in the manuscript, even though much of the data is repeated in his lengthy introduction (116 pages, followed by 71 pages of "Preliminary Remarks"). The collations are made against the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate of 1592 and it includes readings from dozens of other witnesses (see pp. 75–8; collations pp. 80–344).

An interesting feature of the introduction is that Hoskier is sometimes specific about the mechanics of how the polyglot theory plays out in process of copying. For example, he imagines the working conditions of the scribe of Codex Sinaiticus thusly: "Project yourself in theory into the cell or *cabinet de travail* of the scribe of א about A. D. 400. You find him surrounded by his library at his desk. You think to find him close to the Apostolic autographs. But

---

"The Golden Latin Gospels," *The Biblical World* 38 (1911): 67–70, which, again, is quite negative, noting, "in all this one feels that Mr. Hoskier, in his natural enthusiasm for a notable and beautiful manuscript, has been carried too far" (p. 70). In particular Goodspeed criticises Hoskier's identification of forty different scribal hands in such an expensively crafted manuscript; he does, however, admit Hoskier's "extraordinary learning and diligence," despite his "discursive and casual, rather than orderly" working method (pp. 69–70). Cf. also Henry A. Sanders' review in *The American Journal of Philology* 32 (1911): 218–20 and Arthur H. Weston's review in *Classical Philology* 8 (1913): 378–82, who is pedantically critical of Hoskier's paragraphing and the linguistic peculiarities of his prose.

[34] This basic goal of the project is explicated in the subtitle to the collation, which includes the phrase "*etiam in multis locis explicatur de testimonia codd.Graec.*" Understanding the shape of the Greek text is Hoskier's overriding goal in examining Latin manuscripts like JP.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

the retrospect of 350 years to him seems just as great as that of 1850 years today to us…But approach closer and watch him at his task. He sits with a handsome volume open on his left. As far as we can see, it is bicolumnar, but his immaculate sheets of thin white vellum overlie parts of it, and possibly cover a third and yet a fourth column, containing Syriac and Coptic in parallel columns. At any rate, what he appears now to be transcribing from is Graeco-Latin in separate columns, the Greek in the left-hand column. He is at John ii:14, and as his eye goes to the Greek column, he reads βοας και προβατα, the προβατα in the line below; προβατα then is the last thing in his mind. As his eye passes over the Latin he sees *oves*, the last thing on his retina. What more natural than for him to invert and write προβατα και βοας" (pp. lxiv–lxv). This volume is in many ways the fountainhead of the larger project of identifying polyglot interference in the uncials, a project patronised in this instance by the prominent Morgan and his manuscript. This volume is a direct outworking of Hoskier's relationships cultivated on Wall Street. Such patrons are rare and beautiful butterflies.

Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T. Remarks Suggested by the Study of JP and the Allied Questions as Regards the Gospels. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910.[35]

This book stands in the medial position between Hoskier's edition of JP (see previous entry) and his transcription of Codex Usserianus 2 (cf. esp. pp. 109–340). Using his edition of the Golden Latin Gospels as a starting point for his discussion, Hoskier makes a number of critical points that crop up in other works, including his negative appraisal of the text of B and other uncials (e.g. pp. 387–88), criticism of Hort (e.g. pp. viii–ix, 57–60, 97), his polyglot theory, the importance of minuscule witnesses (pp. 61–3), and polemic rebuttals of perceived opponents.[36] This volume is essentially an aggregate of multiple

[35] Cf. Henry A. Sanders, "Hoskier's Genesis of the Versions," *American Journal of Philology* 33 (1912): 30–42, who accepts the basic polyglot principle of Hoskier's theory, but rejects his assertion for two early concurrent forms of Mark; and an anonymous, mostly positive, review in *The Academy and Literature* 82 (1911): 107.

[36] Many, but not all of these attacks are religiously charged. For example, Bousset's critique of Hoskier's 1890 book for his inaction to drawing conclusions is "foolish" (p. x), because Hoskier is building a cumulative case. On Burkitt: "This is truly unscientific of Professor Burkitt, and he must know a great deal better than that" (p. 61); on von Soden's volumes on Cyprian: "I may be very stupid, but I have failed to glean anything new from them, and I do not see in what direction his labours tend" (p. 78); on Albert Edmunds: "Mr. Edmunds is apparently blissfully ignorant, when he write himself down 'as a Christian believer though attached to no sect or Church whatever,' that he is in Marcion's class, and is returning to the vain gods of the second century" (p. 107c); on Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort's use of text types: "we have used the foregoing example, and have illustrated it as

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

studies that all coalesce around the interrelations of the versions and the Greek text – especially Latin traditions – and their deep antiquity, construed at times as nearly concurrent compositions alongside the Greek. If one was forced to identify a thesis, it would be that "there is abundant evidence that the mistakes in א and D, with other like survivals in other Greek and Latin MSS., are due to the use of a polycolumnar polyglot in copying…whichever way we turn we are met with polyglots" (pp. 15–6; cf. p. 75). Hoskier's reconstruction of the materiality of the tradition forms his view of its textual history.

This book also provides the first evidence of his long-term work on the Apocalypse. He notes that as of 1910, he had already collated over one hundred manuscripts and that the text of many of the later minuscules go "far back of א" (p. 17), because they bear the influence of trilingual (Syriac-Graeco-Latin) or even perhaps quadrilingual (Syriac-Graeco-Coptic-Latin) manuscripts that predate א (p. 23). His work on the Apocalypse is deeply connected to his other pet theories. He is correct, however to critique a range of suppositions in textual criticism, many of which have also been critiqued in recent discourse, like the dissolution of geographically bound textual families (p. 24)[37] and the inflexible application of rules like the preference of the shorter reading (pp. 375–76). The book is valuable for understanding Hoskier's programme not only in terms of content, but mode of argumentation, which is, once again, eminently textual in orientation. The main body of the work is a collation that illustrates the relationship between r_2 and other Latin texts, attempting to identify the witness that best preserves the archetype of the tradition and to argue for the close relationship between the Latin and Syriac, which explains his turn to the Diatessaron following lengthy discussion of the Latin (pp. 341–69). Volume 2 is over 400 pages of appendices, comprised primarily of collations of various manuscripts (e.g. the books of Dimma and Moling, among other Latin manuscripts) and comments on some recent text-critical publications and the medical discourse on the blood and water that flowed from Jesus' side at his execution (John 19:34). This is a prime example of the rhetoric of text and data that Hoskier employs in service to those without access to the manuscripts, but also in service to his arguments and polyglot theory. The versions, especially when they agree with the *Textus Receptus*, are more valuable witnesses to the text than the early Greek uncials and papyri. This point comes through clearly in Hoskier's note on W referring to readings that he identifies as "IInd or IIIrd century glosses" (p. 2.379): "that the Church knew what she was doing when she disallowed the reproduction of such unscriptural addenda, and her wisdom is

profusely as space will allow, in order to show in how senseless a way Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort clung to 'type' as a fetish, though opposed to good scholarship and common sense and the consentient voice of the document" (p. 395).

[37] This was applied, not surprisingly, especially to Hort's Western text (e.g. p. 55). Cf. also *Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version*, 124.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

justified in every respect as we recover the pseudohagiographa of the early centuries." The idea that the church heavy-handedly influenced the transmission of particular text forms reappears in a number of Hoskier's writings.

"The Elzevir New Testaments of 1624 and 1633." *JTS* 12 (1911): 454–57.[38]

In this article, Hoskier responds to three articles in the July 1910 fascicle of *JTS*, one by Eb. Nestle and two others by F. C. Burkitt.[39] His first quarrel is with Nestle, who impugns his ability to accurately collate, referring to Hoskier's transcriptions of readings from the 1624 and 1633 Elzevir editions (esp. Heb 9:12 and Rom 6:4).[40] Hoskier reacts to Nestle's rhetorical question of "was Hoskier struck with blindness?" by pointing out typographic changes to different print runs of the Elzevir editions.[41] He defends his own transcriptions, but acknowledges that other printings of the 1933 edition follow the text that Nestle believes mistaken. Hoskier takes offence at the questioning of his accuracy, in which he rightfully takes great pride:[42] "would it not have been more generous of Dr Nestle to have asked me to verify my references before he pilloried me, and threw doubt on my accuracy?" (p. 455).

Hoskier goes on to comment on a recent article by Burkitt, arguing that Burkitt is incorrect to argue against an Irish provenance for the Latin manuscript

[38] Cf. the response by F. C. Burkitt, "Additional Note," *JTS* 12 (1911): 457–59, who sarcastically comments that he is "extremely interested to hear that it [i.e. Codex Claromontanus, Vat. Lat. 7223] was written in Ireland by an Irishman, and I am sure that readers of the *Journal* will be grateful if Mr Hoskier will publish the colophon or note which establishes this important fact" (pp. 457–58). Referring to Hoskier's reputation, Burkitt notes: "I would not quibble at a word, but Mr Hoskier has such a well-deserved reputation for minute accuracy in textual matters, and he is so severe on the lapses of other people, that his statement might very well be understood to imply a higher degree of similarity between Z and the Vulgate portion of Cod. Claromontanus that I imagine to exist" (p. 458).

[39] Eb. Nestle, "Some Points in the History of the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament," *JTS* 11 (1910): 564–68; F. C. Burkitt, "Euangelium Gatianum," *JTS* 11 (1910): 607–11; Burkitt, "A Gothic-Latin Fragment from Antinoe," *JTS* 11 (1910): 611–13.

[40] Cf. Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Evangelium 604*, appendix C.

[41] Nestle does, however, refer to Hoskier as "one of the most conscientious workers in the field" and comments on his admiration ("there can be no greater admirer of his patience than I"), impressions that perhaps accounts for his indignant tone in Hoskier's rebuttal of Scrivener's comments on the differences between the 1624 and 1633 Elzevir editions in *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. (London: George Bell, 1883), 441–43 (Nestle, "Some Points," 565).

[42] Cf. Kirsopp Lake, The Text of the New Testament, 6th ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1933), 76, who notes that Hoskier is "an almost supernaturally accurate collator." Hoskier and Lake appear to have had somewhat of a professional rivalry, although it was probably one-sided. Cf. a letter from Hoskier to J. Rendel Harris 4 February 1929 (DA21/1/2/1/25/19).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

h. This manuscript, according to Hoskier "*is* Irish, was written in Ireland by an Irishman, and has Irish decoration" (p. 456). He concludes with a comment on the Gothic version, arguing that its Greek base is a hitherto unknown form that has a very old "Graeco-Latin-Syriac stem," a classic example of Hoskier's position on the origin of the versions, based in this instance, on Burkitt's review of an edition of an actual Latin-Gothic bilingual manuscript prepared by Paul Glaue.[43]

"The Authorized Version of 1611." *Bibliothecha Sacra* 68 (1911): 693–704.

Writing on the three-hundredth anniversary of the publication of the King James Version, Hoskier takes the opportunity to make two main points. First, he again criticises the "unfortunate and overzealous" 1881 revision based on Westcott and Hort's text; and, second, he argues "against *any* revision at the present time. I feel that this cannot be successfully handled to-day" (p. 693). He reasons along these lines because, although much new Greek and versional material had been published since 1881, there are many missing pieces of the puzzle, and because a suitable methodological basis for a revision has not been established. Even if an agreeable method of "removing errors" in the Greek text can be identified, the issue of translation creates another set of critical issues, and Hoskier points to a lengthy list of perceived errors made by the 1881 revisers as evidence for the problematic nature of revising the 1611 version. At the heart of his objection to a new revision is the idea that "our Bible of 1611 is so precious – obtained through fire and sword, blood and much tribulation – that we cannot safeguard it enough" (p. 696), although he does identify some alterations that are necessary, although not necessarily substantive, like the substitution of "flock" for "fold" in John 10:16.

"New Edition of the Codex Veronensis (*b*)." *The American Journal of Philology* 32 (1911): 220–21.

This piece reviews E. S. Buchanan's edition of the Latin text of the purple manuscript *b* (codex Veronensis).[44] He commends the author for correcting the faulty collation of Bianchini,[45] especially in the light it now sheds on the reading in Luke 23:34. Hoskier commends the volume to Americans in particular,

[43] Paul Glaue and Karl Helm, *Das gotisch-lateinische Bibelfragment der Universiätsbibliothek der Gießen* (Gießen: Töppelmann, 1910).

[44] E. S. Buchanan, *The Four Gospels from Codex Veronensis (b), being the First Complete Edition of the Evangeliarum Purpureum in the Cathedral Library at Verona, with two facsimiles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911).

[45] Giuseppe Bianchini, *Evangeliarium quadruplex latinae versionis antiquae seu veteris italicae* (Rome: de Rubeis, 1749).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

connecting its text to Irenaeus (it "lay on his desk") and his polyglot theory: "we are taking more interest in textual criticism these days and what may not American scholars accomplish if, properly equipped, they lend their aid in unravelling the interesting questions which arise in connection with the great Graeco-Syriac-Latin base of all these manuscripts" (p. 221).

Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version: Covering a Detailed Examination of the Text of the Apocalypse and a Review of the Some of the Writings of the Egyptian Monks. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1911.[46]

This book represents both an explicit preview of Hoskier's argumentation in *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (see below), but also another articulation of his polyglot theory. He blends these concerns in his attempt to "exhibit the coptic element in א in the Apocalypse as an answer to those who think the bohairic version is later than the time of א" (p. 1). In order for the text of Sinaiticus to have been influenced by the Coptic tradition, the Coptic translations must antedate Sinaiticus. Hoskier aims to show that both of these propositions are correct and the weapon he wields in this debate is, once again, extensive collation. Sinaiticus was copied from a Coptic-Graeco polyglot (p. 3), and even corrected from a diglot (p. 7). The legion examples that Hoskier adduces to prove this contention are only convincing in aggregate, even though many of the individual examples are easily explained by other routes beyond polyglot linguistic interference, like mechanical errors in copying, inner-Greek variation, or other less tendentious reasons. For example, few would hold that the variant ισχυσεν/ισχυσαν in Rev 12:8 is truly influenced by a parallel Coptic reading (pp. 34–5).

The second part of the book examines the quotations of some Egyptian monastic writers that Hoskier dates to the fourth century (pp. 117–92). The quotations of these writers show that they were using polyglot manuscripts before the production of א (e.g. pp. 159–60), an argument that supports his two main arguments in the book.

The comments of Goodspeed in his dual review of this volume and *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions* (1910) clearly summarize the critical response to these volumes: "That it all demands for its explanation Mr. Hoskier's quaint theory few will believe, while the extreme positions in which that theory involves its advocates and the anterior improbability of the existence or use of such polyglots in antiquity complete its discomfiture. Mr. Hoskier's view

[46] Cf. the review of this volume and *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions* (1910) in Goodspeed, "Hoskier's Study of the New Testament Versions," 652–54; cf. also a brief statement in S. Gaselee, "Christian Egypt," *Archaeological Report (Egypt Exploration Fund)* (1911–1912): 54–79 (here 57–8), noting Souter's critique of Hoskier's polyglot theory.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

might have been more clearly and compactly and less dogmatically presented. In particular his criticisms of Dr. Hort's textual methods and conclusion suggest that he, like many of Hort's critics, has not fully understood them."[47]

The book also illustrates the progress that Hoskier had made on his Apocalypse collations. A list precedes the volume of the first 123 manuscripts that he has collated, along with a preliminary list of textual groups (eighteen of them) and a short list of "important single manuscripts."

"Evan. 157 (Rome. Vat. Urb. 2)." *JTS* 14 (1912–1913): 78–116; 242–93; 359–84 (3 parts).

This lengthy three-part study explores the text of the carefully prepared twelfth century Vat. Urb. gr. 2 (GA 157), a text that is of importance to Hoskier because of its close relationship with the *Textus Receptus*, especially in Matthew and Mark. These studies are mainly comprised of textual notes and the relationships between this manuscript's interesting Greek readings and the versions, along with collations made against the 1550 Stephanus text. Part II provides some analysis, as well as collations of Luke. The main argument of the series is that the manuscript's text is influenced by linguistic interference from antecedent bilingual copies, perhaps Graeco-Latin, Graeco-Latin-Coptic, and perhaps also some influence from Syriac and other versional traditions (pp. 243–52). Part III is a collation of John without further comment.

"The Lost Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse." *The American Journal of Philology* 34 (1913): 300–14.

This article relays in detail Hoskier's re-discovery of the full Oecumenius commentary in GA 2053, although it was first noticed by Franz Diekamp in 1901.[48] Hoskier identifies this manuscript and its tradition as particularly important for a number of reasons: (1) it offers direct insight, according to him, into the text used by Oecumenius in late antiquity (ca. 600 CE); (2) the text is older than Andrew of Caesarea; and (3) the Oecumenius commentary quotes the lemmatic text of Revelation extensively, as well other New Testament texts, like the disputed words from the cross in Luke 23:34. Hoskier also collates parts of the text with other prominent witnesses, tying the text to a range of versional traditions in support of his polyglot theory. He concludes with a condemnation of

[47] Goodspeed, "Hoskier's Study of the New Testament Versions," 653.

[48] Franz Diekamp, "Mitteilungen über den neu aufgefundenen Kommentar des Oekumenius zur Apokalypse," *Sitzungsbericht der Kgl. Preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaft* 13–14 (1901): 1046–1056; Diekamp, "Neue über die Handschriften des Oekumenius-Kommentares zur Apokalypse," *Biblica* 10/1 (1929): 81–4.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

von Soden's edition for failing to include readings from important minuscule manuscripts.

"The New Codex 'W.'" *Expositor* 5/5 (May 1913): 467–80.

This article responds to the edition of the Freer Gospel codex published by Henry A. Sanders.[49] It functions in part as a review of this work and it adds a number of further observations on W. These include the idea that W was copied from a papyrus book, not unlike P.Oxy. 2, and that its material layout is well-removed from the early bi- and tri-lingual traditions that Hoskier perceives to stand at the early stages of the tradition, along with textual commentary arranged to support his early polyglot theory and the close relationship between W and Coptic traditions (pp. 475–76). Hoskier also perceives "retranslation" from Greek to Latin to Greek in some of W's readings (p. 477). The article concludes with the notation "(to be continued.)," but I can find no obvious second part of the article.

"Von Soden's Text of the New Testament." *JTS* 15/3 (1914): 307–26.

This article constitutes Hoskier's review of Hermann von Soden's entire project.[50] He does not approve: "instead of writing a eulogy on his work I regret to have to condemn it strongly" (p. 307). Hoskier's objections are many. (1) The apparatus of the edition is riven with errors and based in part on out-of-date or otherwise problematic collations. Related to this is the fact that von Soden introduced his own system of abbreviation and nomenclature, a feature of text-critical praxis that Hoskier bemoans in a number of his works (pp. 307–308, 322–23). (2) According to Hoskier, von Soden's eclectic approach leads him to "invent scripture," which leads to further confusion in the apparatus (pp. 308–13). This is worse than Hort's slavish devotion to B and leads to "grotesque" readings or "grave errors" (pp. 312, 316–22), including the omission of readings from ℵ not found in Tischendorf's apparatus. (3) Hoskier can divine no system in von Soden's textual decisions (pp. 313–16), since he follows numerous witnesses in constructing his text, even when the evidence is scant. In essence, he objects to von Soden's reliance on internal criteria. He concludes: "But to state these matters is only to make a partial impression on my readers

[49] Henry A. Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection. The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels* (New York: Macmillan, 1912); Sanders, *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Gospels in the Freer Collection*, 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1912).

[50] Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testament in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–1913).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

of the grievous state of things in this latest book on a most intricate subject. *Es ist zum Weinen*" (p. 326). The timing of Hoskier's very negative review, published in April 1914, could not have been worse, a point not lost on some of his contemporaries.[51] Its publication was initially slated for the January edition, the same month of von Soden's death in a U-Bahn accident in Berlin on 15 January. In *Codex B and its Allies*, 461 Hoskier regrets the tone of his review in light of the circumstances, although he continues to be perniciously critical of von Soden's work, even in his 1937 supplement to his *JTS* article (fasc. 2, pp. 18–9).

Codex B and its Allies: A Study and an Indictment. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

This substantial two-volume work is the pinnacle of Hoskier's polemical attack on Hort, the editors of 1881 Revised Version (who perpetrated the "heresy of our time" [p. 422]), Codex Vaticanus, and other detractors. Like his other works, this book is comprised mainly of hundreds of pages of collations designed to undermine the value of B and related points, creating a full frontal assault on the principles of Westcott and Hort and other critics, especially as Hoskier becomes increasingly exasperated at the end of the volume, often couched in the language of apologetics and idolatry.[52] Hoskier chafes at the

[51] Cf. W. Sanday, "Baron Hermann von Soden," *JTS* 15 (1914): 305–306: "I cannot close this brief and inadequate tribute to a scholar of great eminence without a word, which must be also one of sympathy, for the author of a criticism which appears later in this number. Mr. Hoskier is well known as one of the most independent and most incisive of our writers, with a passion for precise detail. It has fallen to his lot to review the great book, and he has done so in a sense that is adverse, and even hostile. I know that he regrets the unhappy coincidence which brings out his criticism at this particular juncture. It is one thing to throw down a gage of battle before a champion who is in possession of the lists and in the fullest vigour to defend his own cause, and another thing to issue a like challenge over a newly closed grave. All who are connected with *The Journal of Theological Studies* would have wished to avoid such a coincidence; but the article was already paged for the January number of the *Journal*, and on the eve of being printed off at the time of Baron von Soden's death, and the publication of it could only be deferred for the moment" (here p. 306).

[52] Some particularly titillating examples include the following. On Matt 22:10: "I think it is criticism gone absolutely wild and mad to accept νυμφων here, and it is unpardonable of *Hort* to put νυμφων in his text without any alternative in the margin and equally wrong of *Soden*" (p. 66). On followers of Hort: "How many more instances of this kind must I adduce before the worshippers of B and the obsequious slaves of Hort will allow that I am right?" (p. 84). Responding to a criticism of Alexander Souter: "Don't condemn me in this cavalier fashion then, if you please, but look into these matters a little more carefully" (p. 313). On Burkitt: "He has said, rather unnecessarily, of me that I do not know the difference between a dilettante and a scholar. However that may be, I think I can detect the difference between an unbeliever and a believer!" (p. 357). Hoskier goes on to accuse Burkitt of apostasy; if you don't have anything nice to say, I guess it should be said in a footnote. Although

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

idea that B preserves a neutral text, charging "an indictment against the MS B and against Westcott and Hort, subdivided into hundreds of separate counts" (p. i). The book is therefore a somewhat roundabout attempt to "sing the Death-song of B as a neutral text" (p. iii). The larger argument that stands in the background of this book is, again, the idea that the texts of the uncials are in fact corrupted and that they fell into disuse because of this fact. Therefore, the *Textus Receptus*, the text that the church relied upon until Westcott and Hort, is the true text. The *Textus Receptus* is ancient, and was bungled into the text found in the uncials by polyglot interference. B's text in particular is the result of the conscious editing of scribes who presume to know better than the inspired authors they were tasked with transmitting. These scribes "mutilated" the text. Another explanation for this phenomenon that Hoskier posits is the concurrent composition of Mark in both Greek and Latin. The Latin text was, according to Hoskier, later translated into Greek, creating two early Greek forms of Mark (pp. 126–207). This theory strains credulity on a number of fronts.

Despite the obvious issues with such a strong stance, the book also develops Hoskier's methodological profile, emphasising tedious attention to the detail of the tradition writ large, the patient digestion of data, and hard fought conclusions. One of his main charges that he levels at his opponents, tendentious though it is, is that their consensus conclusions are based only on partial data. The conventional wisdom, for Hoskier, is based on partial and inadequate information. This belief explains the depth of his textual rhetoric and devotion to collation, as well as his extended critique of Hort's method (pp. 1–13) and criticism of the shorter reading canon (e.g. p. 54). The book also demonstrates that Hoskier's critical goal is a religious desire to find the "true," unadulterated text of the New Testament, and that those who identify this text wrongly are heretics, leading the young and impressionable astray. Hort's text is not only wrong, but heretical (pp. 468–73).

The second volume of the book attempts to further discredit the text of the uncials by driving a wedge between א and B in the Gospels. The point again is to undermine the value of key witnesses for Westcott and Hort. Once again, deficiencies in א are chalked up to copying from polyglots (e.g. pp. 146–47), relying on reams of data devoid of much analysis.

The Text of Codex Usserianus 2., or r2 ("Garland of Howth") with Critical Notes to Supplement and Correct the Collation of the Late T. K. Abbott. Old Latin Biblical Texts. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1919.

Hoskier began preparation of this volume in 1914 and its publication was delayed by the Great War (p. iii). He devotes an entire book to this particular

he is quite high on C. H. Turner: "I suppose that it will readily be conceded that C. H. Turner is without question the most brilliant writer on Textual Criticism today" (p. vii).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

manuscript because it is a witness to an old Latin text. The transcription that comprises the main portion of the piece – and which is a feat of printing with its many special characters that mirror the palaeography of the manuscript – is necessary because previous publications, especially T. K. Abbott's, are shot through with errors that number in the thousands if orthographical peculiarities are considered (p. iii; cf. the thirty-seven pages of corrections to Abbott's collation in the appendix).[53] The transcription follows not only the textual peculiarities, but also attempts to present the form, line structure, and palaeographic profile of the manuscript. It is an attempt at a manual facsimile. See Hugh Houghton's article in this volume that explores this manuscript and its text in detail.

"Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations, part I." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 7/1 (1922): 118–37.

This series of five articles functions as a precursor to *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*. They deal with minuscule manuscripts from the tenth century onward, since, according to Hoskier, many later manuscripts "throw much light on the transmission of the text" (p. 118). This first article also articulates his motivation for devoting so much time to the Apocalypse, and it illuminates his own knowledge of the ground-breaking nature of his method: "Never before has a comprehensive examination such as this been undertaken for any book of the New Testament. I selected the Apocalypse simply because it was possible for an individual to handle the matter within his lifetime" (p. 118). His three critical observations in this article are (1) that the text of Erasmus' choice of manuscript corresponds to the majority textual form; (2) that he has not identified any Complutensian text witnesses that bear the singularities of Stunica's edition; and (3) that his own numeration system is superior to both Gregory's and von Soden's. He analyses the text of manuscript 200 (GA 2329), arguing that the text's age rivals that of the great uncials. His high valuation of this witness corresponds to his lengthy treatment of it in *Concerning the Text*, 1.637–52 and its status as a "consistently cited witness" in NA[28].[54]

[53] T. K. Abbott, *Evangeliorum versio Antehieronymiana ex codice Ussheriano* (Dublin: Hodges and Figgis, 1884).

[54] Cf. also Darius Müller, "Die Apokalypse-Handschriften GA 2329 und 2351: Textkritische und textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu zwei 'ständigen Zeugen für die Apokcalypse' in Nestle-Aland[28]," in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ANTF 50, ed. M. Sigismund and D. Müller (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 369–410. Hoskier mentions this article in a letter to J. Rendel Harris on 17 May 1922 (DA21/1/2/1/25/7) and that he plans to write a second in the series.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

"Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations, part II." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 7/2 (1923): 256–68.

This article deals with manuscripts 201 (GA 2351), a partially preserved manuscript with a previously unknown commentary – the so-called *Scholia in Apocalypsin*.[55] In addition to rapping Adolf von Harnack on the knuckles for producing a poor edition and listing out the edition's errors,[56] Hoskier catalogues the significant readings of this manuscript and its shared agreements with other text clusters. He continues with a brief analysis of the commentary and, after listing out the many errors of Harnack's edition in this portion of the text, concludes with Harnack that Origen was the likely author, although some *scholia* can be traced to other sources. He concludes with a short note on 202 (GA 2352), which he identifies as having a Complutensian text.

"Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations, part III." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 7/3 (1923): 507–25.

This article examines manuscript 143 (GA 2050), dated to 1107. This piece reads very much like an entry in volume 1 of *Concerning the Text*, containing brief material descriptions, palaeographic comments, and information on its familial relations. This particular witness, for Hoskier, "stands quite apart from any traditional family groups" (p. 508), an observation that is supported by recent *Text und Textwert* data that shows 2050 agreeing with LA 2/ in 51% of readings.[57] Hoskier uses this textual data to argue that the manuscript is the progeny of an ancient Greco-Coptic manuscript produced and used in North Africa (p. 508). Because he perceives the peculiarities of the text to be ancient, Hoskier carefully catalogues its significant readings, drawing deep connections

[55] This manuscript has attracted much interest recently. Cf. Garrick V. Allen, "The Reception of Scripture and Exegetical Resources in the *Scholia in Apocalypsin* (GA 2351)," in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Traditions*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2016), 141–63; P. Tzamalikos, *An Ancient Commentary on the Book of Revelation: A Critical Edition of the Scholia in Apocalypsin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

[56] C. Diobouniotis and A. Harnack, *Der Scholien-Kommentar des Origenes zu Apokalypse Johannis*, TU 3/8 (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1911). Hoskier (p. 256) states that "this publication is not only faulty and inaccurate, but the pride of the scholar has caused Harnack to print his suppositious emendations in the text of the work and the real readings of the MS. are relegated to the footnotes, an inverted and pernicious manner of editing a document, so far unique, to which the present writer seriously objects." Hoskier is methodologically opposed to conjectural emendation as a principle.

[57] M. Lembke et al., eds., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. VI. Die Apokalypse. Teststellenkollation und Auswertungen* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 568–69.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

to the Coptic tradition. The text of this manuscript, for Hoskier, touches "the faint spots" of the tradition and gets behind the text of Codex Sinaiticus.

"Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations, part IV." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 8/1 (1924): 236–75.

The fourth article in the series examines manuscript 130 (GA 1854) in depth, mustering textual analysis in support of the deep antiquity of the versions and the idea that the Greek text was influenced at an early stage by the proliferation of polyglottal exemplars: "its original polyglot base is veneered with a much later strain of eclectic polyglot readings and re-readings" (p. 236). In other words, polyglots on top of polyglots; piles of polyglot polyglots. This analysis is supported further by a thirteen page "P.S." notation that also advances this same critical aim. This theory, for Hoskier, answers a legitimate critical observation: that these medieval manuscripts seem to preserve, in part, very ancient texts, texts that are often mixed and which sometimes correspond to versional traditions, a phenomenon also known as block mixture. Ancient polyglots at the very base of the beginning of transmission is the only all-encompassing response that Hoskier can divine (pp. 240–75). He clarifies this relationship: "I do not mean to say that *all* the sporadic agreement with the Versions, – first with one and then with another, – is *all* due to their reflect action on the Greek. But I *do* mean to say that *most* of it is" (p. 270, emphasis original).

"Manuscripts of the Apocalypse – Recent Investigations, part V." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 8/2 (1924): 412–43.

In the final article of the series, Hoskier examines the readings of a number of manuscripts, focusing again on their close relationship to the versions (e.g. GA 94 141 208 2081). For example, GA 2081 (Hoskier 179) is of value because it stands close to many readings in Crawford's Syriac edition, even though it was "carelessly copied in the early stages of its reproduction" (p. 413). Hoskier also, in a moment of candour, recognizes that his polyglot theory may be difficult to swallow: "I hope, however, [the reader] may gradually come to see that I am not perversely afflicted with any wish to over-emphasise [my polyglot theory]. I simply cannot get away from it" (p. 420). The article concludes with a lengthy poetic composition meditating on divine names in the Bible which reappears at the end of the introduction in the first volume of *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, a pious articulation of his motivation to undertake detailed textual work. It is followed by the comment that "this is why I am concerned to recover, as far as it is possible, the exact wording of this sublime message to the Churches and to Humanity-at-large" (p. 443).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Immortality. Boston: The Stratford Company, 1925.

This volume is the first of Hoskier's philosophical works, previewing a number of ideas that he develops in the more substantial volumes in the 1930s. Ideas like the "back of beyond" are introduced here – the metaphysical location of human origins where individuality ceases – along with the essential deific nature of all humanity and organized religion's inability to properly reflect the metaphysics of the universe. The goal of life is not to cheat death or experience eternal life on earth, but to "take wings and leave earth" (p. 1) in a metaphorical sense, although the mechanics of this operation are not entirely clear. In order to fundamentally reconceive notions of the goal of existence and models of the afterlife, Hoskier appeals to comparative religious studies and argues at length for the veracity of various forms of spirit communication, arguing that eastern religions stand closer to the origins of an initial revelation between some "extramundane Creator and Ruler" (pp. 2–3) than do Christianity or Judaism. He examines side-by-side, for example, texts from the Bahgavad-Gita, portions of the New Testament,[58] and spirit communication through a certain Mdme. de Watteville and other mediums (pp. 5–13).[59] The book progresses by exploring the thought of important – at least by Hoskier's measure – ancient literati from Hesiod to Plato, Moses to Sophocles, divining their proximity to the origins of the first "Revelation." These traditions in all their breadth function as witnesses to ancient events. In a way, Hoskier exercises text-critical operations on tradition-historical resources, attempting to remove errors to arrive at a religion unadulterated by tradition, change, and human error. Accessing this event will help humanity to realise the nature of their immortality, which has been muddled by the passage of time. The rest of Hoskier's philosophical tracts develop these ideas further, sometimes in unexpected ways. The ideas herein are, in addition to being controversial (to put it mildly), sometime troubling, like his adoration of the French theosophist Joseph Alexander Saint-Yves d'Alveydre (and other French spiritualists),[60] whose Eurocentric and supersessionist rhetoric dominates in Hoskier's extended interaction with his work.[61] The book is

[58] For Hoskier, the New Testament is riven with "occultist" happenings (pp. 115–28), mustering passages that connect Jesus' perspective to his own theosophonic viewpoint. He even offers his text-critical work and the unearthing of new readings as further evidence of the occult nature of the New Testament (e.g. pp. 127–28).

[59] Hoskier also mentions "Mrs de W." briefly in a letter to J. Rendel Harris, 14 June 1922 (DA21/1/2/1/25/11).

[60] This book also contains Hoskier's only explicit comments on what he calls Spiritism or Spiritualism and spirit communication, perspectives that also impinge on his text-critical work in *Concerning the Text* (cf. pp. 136–246). For Hoskier, "incredulity in spirit phenomena is simply and solely due to ignorance" (p. 150).

[61] Cf. Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, *Les Mission des Juifs* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1884); cf. also the spiritualist writings of Jean-Baptiste Eugène Nus, e.g. *Les Grands mystères: vie*

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

fundamentally an esoteric history of the world from the first Egyptian dynasty (the time of the theocratic and esoteric "Kingdom of Ram") to modern Spiritualism and theosophy, built on surmise, conjecture, and coincidence, but also experience with ancient manuscripts, archaeology, and the progressive evolutionary science of the early twentieth century. An interesting connection between the argument of this work and Hoskier's academic publications is the idea that the scientists and the wise are the true guardians of truth and justice preserved from the earliest forms of "true Religion" (pp. 98–9). Hoskier's harping on the "scientific" nature of textual criticism – even critiquing Hort in *Codex B and its Allies* by exclaiming "where is the science?" – is not a mere methodological critique, but a theological one. This volume explains some of the invective of his pre-war work. Hoskier's "living God" is "WISDOM AND SCIENCE" (p. 102), and Jesus is the historical figure who embodied ancient "true Religion" in its fullest sense (pp. 103–105). The book demonstrates that Hoskier's philosophical and religious views are derived in part from nineteenth century reports of conversations between spirits and French mediums, and it is clear that he has had first hand experiences in such settings.

The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse: Now Printed for the First Time from Manuscripts at Messina, Rome, Salonika, and Athos. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1928 [repr. Wipf & Stock, 2008].[62]

This edition, which follows the text of GA 2053 as far as possible, is built on the evaluation of nine manuscripts.[63] Hoskier correctly places Oecumenius before Andrew historically, and points out Andrew's dependence on Oecumenius. He prefaces the edition with a substantial discussion of Oecumenius' language, interpretive proclivities, intertexts, modes of quotation, the familial characteristics of his lemmatic text, theology, and strategies of interpretation.

---

universelle, vie individuelle, vie sociale (Paris: Noirot, 1866), which Hoskier references on pp. 105–14.

[62] Reviewed by Ernst Benz in *Gnomon* 6 (1930): 341–45; Alexander Souter in *The Classical Review* 43/6 (1929): 240; K. Staab in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1931): 374–79: Aimé Puech in *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* (1929): 425–26; P. Ubaldi in *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 59 (1931): 419–20; Henri-Charles Puech in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 106 (1932): 465–66; J. Behm in *Orientalsiche Literaturzeitung* 37 (1934): 170; A. C. in *Aegyptus* 11/4 (1931): 509. Hoskier first mentions his plan to publish the Oecumenius commentary in a letter to J. Rendel Harris of 17 May 1922 (DA21/1/2/1/25/7) and comments on the "unkind" review in *JTS* 31 (1929): 54–8 (which also reviews *Concerning the Text*) in a letter of 18 December 1929 (DA21/1/2/1/25/23).

[63] Cf. the recent edition of Marc de Groote, ed., *Oecumenii Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (Leuven: Peeters, 1999) and an English translation by John N. Suggit, *Oecumenius: Commentary on the Apocalypse*, The Fathers of the Church 112 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2006).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

Like much of Hoskier's editorial work, the preface is structured in an intuitive way (at least intuitive to Hoskier), where each of these topics are interwoven according to Hoskier's own concerns which are not always explicit. (Although Puech's review notes that "son *Introduction* est fort instructive," despite the multiple accenting mistakes in the text.) The preface gives special emphasis to Oecumenius' mystical interpretation and his lengthy quotation of Methodius (e.g. pp. 12–3), as well as the customary description of the manuscripts utilised in the construction of the edition and their textual relationships (pp. 16–25). The edition is now superseded by Marc de Groote's 1999 edition, but Hoskier's text is aesthetically pleasing and his apparatus accurate.

Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collation of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen's Third Edition Together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch. 1929.[64]

The two stout volumes of *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* are the greatest of Hoskier's contribution to textual scholarship. Despite the presence of idiosyncrasies like the polyglot theory (e.g. p. 1.444), the presence of readings divined from spirit communication (p. 1.xxxviii),[65] exclamations about poor collations,[66] and strident critiques of Hort (e.g. pp. 1.xlvii–lxvi), this work represents the first ever attempt to catalogue every reading from every known manuscript for a particular New Testament work. The task took over thirty years to complete and is the pinnacle of Hoskier's methodological emphasis on comprehensiveness, patient tedium, and data aggregation (e.g. p. 1.128). The first volume (751 pages in all) contains a substantial introduction and a description of every manuscript in his edition. The prolegomena is consistently Hoskierian, lacking a clear structure and jumping from topic to topic without

[64] Reviewed very positively by León Vaganay in *Revue des Scienes Religieuses* 13/2 (1933): 295–96: "En un temps où les critiques sont si nombreux, il peut paraître étrange qu'un livre de valeur passe inaperçu. C'est cependant ce qui est arrivé, du moins dans les milieux de langue française, pour le dernier ouvrage de M. Hoskier sur le texte de l'Apocalypse. Sauf erreur, aucune revue n'en a parlé. Or c'est là, à notre avis, une œuvre monumentale digne de retenir l'attention." And "enfin, et surtout, il nous donne là un bel exemple de labeur ingrat, accompli quand même avec le soin le plus scrupuleux, notamment en ce qui concerne la tradition des manuscrits grecs. Il mérite de ce fait la reconnaissance de tous les savants qui auront à s'occuper de l'Apocalypse. Son œuvre restera longtemps l'instrument de travail indispensable." Vaganay even argues that Hoskier's approach is superior to that of Westcott-Hort and von Soden.

[65] Other spiritist perspectives are found through the volumes. E.g. p. 1.358 on the significance of the various precious stones in Revelation 21 and a lengthy paragraph in Latin on the numerology of Rev 13:18 (p. 2.365).

[66] E.g. "It is painful to realize how few men are qualified to collate accurately, even when striving to do their best" (p. 7).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

discussion on their relatedness. This section provides a number of insights into Hoskier's motivation and method for such a herculean project. He is influenced not simply by textual questions, but theological ones. He interprets Rev 8:9 in light of the Great War and argues that the sinking of one-third of the world's shipping during the conflict is a fulfilment of the text – the Apocalypse is important to understand because the eschaton is drawing nigh (p. 1.ix).[67] The goal of the project, however, is threefold: (1) to understand the full history of the text; (2) to prove the error of the "elder documents," likely referring to the uncials; and (3) to identify Greek readings that antedate the fourth century, readings that are now lost among the mass of minuscules (p. 1.x). Implicit also in this introduction is a call to adopt his method as a model, a mode of operation that *will* answer the remaining questions of the field, and a desire to critique the revisers of the Authorized Version (pp. 1.xii–xiv). The *Textus Receptus*, apart from its obvious errors, will be vindicated by way of textual criticism as a venerable and ancient form of the text, protected by God's providence (p. 1.137, 317). Hoskier also lays out his conclusions relating to Revelation's textual families, asserting relationships by juxtaposition and sometimes collation. Hoskier's attempt at constructing text families, however, is less than successful, a point that his early champions even noted.[68] His families were undermined by Josef Schmid's seminal study,[69] whose work has been further undercut by the recent *Text und Textwert* data.[70]

Following the introduction, the catalogue of manuscripts commences, allowing only six pages for a discussion of the uncials. The average manuscript description comments upon a number of issues, including the location, owner, call number(s), date and means of collation, family characteristics, palaeographic observations, mention of writing support, scribal habits, comments on the bibliographic context of Revelation, and engagement with previous scholarship on the specific manuscript. Each of these features are discussed in order to properly date the document in an effort to understand the context of its text, which is the underlying goal of these profiles. The group to which the manuscript belongs, according to Hoskier, is noted at the head of the entry, with no further comment, although he often shows via collation how the manuscript

[67] On this same page, he also notes the negative effect of his war wounds on his right hand and eyesight. Cf. also his letter to J. Rendel Harris of 22 April 1922, where he notes that his eyes are "giving out," although he has still enough sight to able to critique Harnack and Gregory (DA21/1/2/1/25/6).

[68] Cf. Henry A. Sanders, "The Beatty Papyrus of Revelation and Hoskier's Edition," *JBL* 53/4 (1934): 371–80, even though Sanders' article takes Hoskier's groupings as the basis for his analysis of the relationship between P^{47} and the rest of the tradition.

[69] Josef Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes. 2. Teil. Die alten Stämme* (Munich: Karl Zink, 1955).

[70] Cf. Lembke et al., *Text und Textwert* (2017). Cf. Hoskier's listing of families in *Concerning the Text*, 1.7–12.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

preserves the special readings of that sub-group. For example, the group of Apoc. 20 (GA 175) is identified as 4-20-48-64-74 and eight readings are produced in support of this association (p. 1.38). For the most part these profiles are uneven, and the connection between groupings and the material in a given profile are often unexpressed, even though the primary aim of the catalogue is to eliminate witnesses and families in an attempt to identify the "original" text (p. 1.108). He identifies ten major groups (including a group inclusive of all the uncials), along with a number of "composite documents" and important single manuscripts (cf. pp. 2.23–4). In usual Hoskierian fashion, there are also a number of entertaining, and even charming, polemic moments.[71]

The second volume comprises a re-edition of Stephanus' 1550 text that includes a comprehensive apparatus of every Greek reading in every manuscript catalogued in volume one, along with versional witness (Syriac, Sahidic, Bohairic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Latin) and church fathers (Dionysius, Hippolytus, Methodius, Oecumenius, Victorinus, Tertullian, Cassiodorus, Primasius, Cyprian, Tyconius, Apringius, pseudo-Ambrose). These latter data are not as trustworthy as the Greek readings derived directly from manuscripts.

This volume represents a continuation of the arguments of the first volume, attempting to show the corruption in the uncial manuscripts and to demonstrate that the *Textus Receptus* is indeed a quality representative of the "original" text. The mode of argumentation differs, however, insofar as it is purely textual. And Hoskier even acknowledges the rhetorical edge of his edition: "for there is an argument on every page" (p. 2.7). For each verse, the text of Stephanus heads the page in bold type, followed by a comprehensive list of every variation from this text in every manuscript. The volume comprises 649 pages and is the most complete collection of data on the Apocalypse aggregated to this date, even though 71 further witnesses to Revelation have been discovered since its publication.

De Contemptu Mundi: A Bitter Satirical Poem of 3000 Lines upon the Morals of the XIIth Century by Bernard of Morval Monk of Cluny (fl. 1150) Re-edited, with Introduction and Copious Variants from all the Know MSS. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.[72]

---

[71] E.g. after a detailed list of errors in Reiche's collations: "Surely we can cease here. Of all the unwelcome tasks this is the worst, though we have but shown a small part of Reiche's shortcomings. It is pitiful, pitiful. We can all forgive a man for failing to record some readings which have escaped his eyesight, but deliberately to misrepresent and misquote throughout is not permissible. Reiche's dust cannot rise up and apologize, but we can learn a lesson not to mar these studies with such wicked pitfalls. God knows enough exist naturally" (p. 151).

[72] Reviewed by Samuel H. Cross in *Speculum* 5 (1930): 451–52; H. E. Butler in *The Modern Language Review* 25 (1930): 359–60, in which he refers to Hoskier's disorderly

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

This handsome folio edition of the twelfth-century satirical Latin poem of Bernard de Cluny demonstrates the breadth of Hoskier's interests and technical skill. It also shows that his primary form of rhetoric, even in issues beyond the New Testament, is textual scholarship. This is the only critical eclectic edition that Hoskier ever constructed beside his edition of the Oecumenius commentary,[73] even though he edited numerous individual documents and reissued Stephanus' 1550 text along with a comprehensive list of readings in the Apocalypse in *Concerning the Text*. The preface demonstrates his perception of Bernard's genius, as well as his disdain for previous editions and translations of his work, especially when they self-censor portions of the poem. "I feel convinced," he says, "that Bernard's poem has only to be put in its entirety in the hands of the intelligent Public of to-day for this reading public to rise up and call him blessèd" (p. xi). The organization of the edition is Hoskierian insofar as its introduction lacks a clear structure and the greatest depth of all textual minutiae are plumbed (cf. his catalogue and description of the eighteen manuscripts on pp. xxii–xxxiv). In his review, Butler's main critique is the structure of the introduction, which he calls "diffuse, ill-arranged and full of repetitions."[74] The goal of the edition is not utility, but comprehensiveness, even though the main text is relatively unencumbered. His editorial work still serves as the *editio princeps* for this medieval work.

The Bronze Horses: A Comment on the Prose-poem of Amy Lowell. Portland, ME: Mosher Press, 1930.

This short book, a mere eighteen pages, uses the controlling metaphor of the bronze horses from Amy Lowell's poem as a way to describe the cyclical nature of time. It represents a continuation of Hoskier's philosophical trajectory, but it is ultimately pessimistic in its prescient appraisal of the belligerence of nation-states that might lead to another great conflict. It contains some linguistic charms, but also many tortured sentences. Although published in 1930, the date on the last page is 1926. It is not hard to imagine why it took so long to locate a publisher.

What is Nirvana? Portland, ME: Mosher Press, 1930.[75]

---

introduction and cumbrous apparatus as a "labour of love." Hoskier describes finishing the manuscript in a letter to J. Rendel Harris of 20 February 1929 (DA21/1/2/1/25/20).

[73] Although he follows the text of GA 2053 for the Oecumenius commentary whenever possible.

[74] Butler in *Modern Language Review*, 360.

[75] Mentioned in a letter to J. Rendel Harris, 10 January 1930 (DA21/1/2/1/25/25).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

This humble volume comprises a slim thirteen pages. The preface orients the discussion around the afterlife in religious traditions, focusing on the idea of nirvana that Hoskier adopts from Hinduism. He describes the main body of the work as a "Credo" of his own perspective on the afterlife, which is "quite in accord with boundless love, and which will be found also quite in harmony with a scientific attitude towards universal motion and universal chemistry, and which answers every question of every seeker-after-truth, and also provides a satisfactory solution to an apparently hitherto insoluble problem" (p. 7). The main thrust of the piece is that all people all essentially deific and that this essential nature is attainable after the "unclothing" of death, but I remain sceptical that Hoskier has unlocked all the answers to the afterlife, which is a goal almost as ambitious as reconstructing the "original" text of the New Testament.

In Tune with the Universe. London: Rider & Co., 1932 [Pseudonym "Signpost"].

This is one of Hoskier's most substantive philosophical treatises, building off his perspectives on the afterlife in *What is Nirvana?* Interestingly, Hoskier writes an obsequious forward to Signpost's work in his own name. Esoteric jargon defines the work, whose primary argument is that all people are part of the "All Life," a reality that disposes of individualism in all its forms: "realize that you are not your brother's keeper, but that you are your brother" (p. iv). He calls for an internal disarmament that defines much of human interaction (e.g. p. 29), provocatively using the language of early 1930s European political discourse. The treatise gives the overall impression that Hoskier views modern nation-states and liberal democracies as the negative outworking of human individualism (cf. his solution on pp. 120–21).[76] Nonetheless, the goal of human existence, for Hoskier, is to transcend the vibrational world to the "world of causes lying behind it" (p. 1) by ceasing to look to transcendent deities, by looking inside oneself to their own inner "godhood": "you don't look up, but you look within" (p. 5). Within this treatise he appeals to Christian traditions – or at least couches his language in conventional Christian pious terminology – and other non-conventional avenues, like various societies for psychic research (p. 13). This book is at times progressive, but also reflects predominant and problematic racial and class stereotypes of the period (e.g. pp. 31–8, 129). Finally, the book offers access to Hoskier's perceptions of his major life events, including his marriage (p. 70), service in the Great War (pp. 94–5), and his numismatics collecting (pp. 131–32).

"Concerning את and its Very Special Use in the Old Testament." Pages 96–117 in *Amiticiæ Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris,*

[76] Cf. also Hoskier, *Back of Beyond*, 47, 62–4, 68–70.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

C.Litt. on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday. Edited by H. G. Wood. London: University of London Press, 1933.

This article best represents a fusion of Hoskier's academic work and philosophical proclivities, as he explores the numinous and esoteric value of the "designatory particle" in Hebrew. He finds previous grammatical and linguistic explanations of this word "arid" (p. 96) and notes that: "Well, in the first place, it is significant that it is composed of the *first* and *last* letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and therefore undoubtedly corresponds to the Alpha and Omega of all things, the *wholeness* of the thing characterized or designated, the oneness, the entireness of a thing, or, as Fabre d'Olivet[77] says, its 'ipseity' *in toto*, through and through" (p. 96). He advocates for highly invested exegetical signification in the use of את. For example, Gen 1:1 should be translated, "At the first in principle created He, the Elohim, the *whole ipseity* of the Heavens with that of the Earth" (emphasis original). Similar translations are applied to examples of את in the Psalter and Isaiah. The word, then, functions not as a marker of the direct object, but as a circumlocution for fullness, principality, or basic inherent forms, and he appeals to folk etymologies to support this distinction. Ultimately, this theory is an attempt to locate the concept of the "Back of Beyond," a major part of his theosophonic philosophy, in the Old Testament, however obliquely. I have been unable to locate any citations of this article.[78]

The Back of Beyond. London: The Daniel Company, 1934 [Pseudonym "Signpost"].

This book covers much of the same ground as *In Tune with the Universe*, but includes a fuller discussion of the characteristics of the world of non-vibrationdom, the place where the world of effects is transcended – the "ocean of primordial being" (p. 11). This is something that need not wait for death to be

[77] Fabre d'Olivet (1767–1825) was a French author and dabbling Hebraist whose hermeneutical approaches and philosophy influenced many occultists, Hoskier included. Hoskier also cites d'Olivet's *Histoire philosophique du genre humain, ou L'homme considéré sous ses rapports religieux et politiques dans l'état social, à toutes les époques et chez les différents peuples de la terre, précédée d'une dissertation introductive sur les motifs et l'objet de cet ouvrage*, 2 vols. (Paris: Hubert, 1824) in *In Tune with the Universe,* viii and engages deeply with his work in *Immortality*, a book that also briefly mentions the mystical symbolism of particular Hebrew graphemes (pp. 259–61). I suspect that d'Olivet's *La Langue hébraïque restituée et les veritable sens des mots hébreux rétabil et prouvé par leur analyse radicale* (Paris: Eberhart, 1815) forcefully influenced this particular article.

[78] This article is similar to an extract on the "House of Jad" (יד) that Hoskier sent to J. Rendel Harris on 17 May 1922 (DA21/1/2/1/25/7), but which was never published as far as I can tell. This type of overwrought lexicographic exegesis appears in muted ways in a number of Hoskier's works.

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

accomplished, but which is accessible by "birth into a new dimensional activity" (p. 17). Esotericism, once again, reigns in this book, but the goal is revelation: "the following contribution is made with the objective of loosening some of the scale which obscure [Man's] vision, and of enabling him to participate here and now in the advancement of his own interests, to the point where competition shall yield to a glorious co-operation, and when man shall rejoice in the drama in which he is an enforced actor, and play his part to the satisfaction of himself and of his audience, instead of wondering what it is all about" (p. 8). He even appeals to Jesus' relationship to God (cf. John 10:30) as an analogy (p. 21), and points to the destabilizing nature of recent papyrological discoveries of the New Testament, arguing that recent manuscript discoveries fundamentally question established ecclesiological structures (pp. 36–7). This perspective explains his interest in the Chester Beatty Papyri that dominates his final publications.[79] Textual scholarship remains essential for his philosophical discourse, even if only by analogy. Organized religion of all stripes, however, is a false path (pp. 53–7, 77–82). Hoskier seeks freedom from the material world in the ethereal plane of the "Back of Beyond" (p. 97). The front matter of the book also suggests that Hoskier was in 1934 preparing a concordance to the Sanskrit epic Mahabharata. There is no evidence that this was ever published, but a manuscript that may be a partial draft of this work is now at the Bibliothèque municipale de Lyon. See Jan Krans' contribution to this volume.

"A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles." *JTS* 38 (1937): 148–63.

Like much of his textual analysis, Hoskier's interest in P^{46}, which carries on also into his final book, is tied to his polyglot theory. "We need only examine the text," he opines, "in order to rest assured that we are in the presence of something which is contemporaneous with, or which may have preceded the compilation of, the Sahidic version; thus, the circumstantial evidence is definite,[80] for that is generally attributed to a period *circa* A.D. 190" (p. 149). P^{46} is especially important for Hoskier because it provides the opportunity to reach a form of the Greek text that antedates the Sahidic, a version that he thinks unduly influenced later forms of the Greek tradition through polyglottal linguistic interference. Even though P^{46} helps to do this, it is already marked by linguistic influence from Coptic traditions, Latin, and Syriac (pp. 149–50). Hoskier waxes eloquent on being in the presence of an ancient witness, but the

[79] In a preceding study, Henry A. Sanders, "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," *HTR* 27/2 (1933): 77–98 defends some of Hoskier's points in *Codex B and its Allies*, but criticises his rejection of the papyri as valuable textual witnesses (pp. 77–8).

[80] Is circumstantial evidence ever definite?

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

substance of the article is in his discussions of linguistic oddities and the ethics of scribes as copyists. There is little new insight on the text of P^{46}. His technical ability to handle diverse materials and linguistic traditions is obvious, but not necessarily his analytical aptitude. I suspect that Hoskier is interested to comment on this manuscript because it is both new and very ancient, and his prose and structure of the article reflect his antiquarian interest, along with his usual idiosyncrasies, which are at this stage equal parts charming and alarming, like his continued and unrelenting assault on renderings in the Revised Version (p. 160).

Appendix to an Article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles known as P^{46} in the Journal of Theological Studies *no. 150 Setting Forth Here in Supplementary Detail the Shorter Text of that Important Document*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937.

The end of Hoskier's previous article mentions a supplementary publication that he had prepared, which focused on further text-critical data pertaining to P^{46}. Readers of the journal were encouraged to purchase this additional information since the *Journal* refused to publish it. This additional data comprises in this volume, which is two very short fascicles that further reflect on his previous article. With his polyglot theory still intact, Hoskier examines the omissions in P^{46} (vis-à-vis the *Textus Receptus*), arguing that many of the peculiarities of the text are the result of a "critical" approach of the scribe, by which he seems to infer intentional alterations: "revising hands were continuously busy trying to improve Paul's epistolary methods" (p. 2). Like his earlier critiques of the text of Vaticanus, Hoskier intends to show that the early manuscripts are more corrupt than the *Textus Receptus* due to intentional editorial activity, although some of the "omissions" of P^{46} likely reflect "original" readings. The volumes includes the following data: (1) a supplementary list of omissions; (2) reflections on the degenerative nature of textual transmission (the written vs. the oral word); and (3) readings that P^{46} shares with the Ethiopic version (see Curt Niccum's article in this volume). Together, the two fascicles comprise twenty-seven pages.

A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester-Beatty Papyrus P^{46} (circa 200 A.D.). London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938.

The goal of Hoskier's final book is to affirm the recently published P^{46} of the Chester Beatty collection[81] as a most valuable witness in reconstructing the text

[81] F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* (London: Emery Walker, 1933–1937).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission

of the Pauline Epistles (pp. 65–6), focusing his attention on Hebrews. But, like much of his previous work, this overarching argument is not always easy to divine among the mass of collations and scattered analysis. The book also contains a number of unexpected digressions – like the appeal to Egyptian hieroglyphics, the Book of the Dead, Sanskrit, compound verbs in the Septuagint, and the first person singular pronominal forms in Hebrew to explain a variant at Heb 9:3 (pp. 7–28, 73) – which contributes to a somewhat chaotic structure. Hoskier continued to digest new discoveries into his larger programme of critique of Hort's text and of polyglot proclivities. The main body of the work is a textual commentary on particular readings – not always following the serial order of Hebrews – that emphasises primarily connections to the versions, especially the Bohairic (e.g. p. 63). For Hoskier, this form of the text traces its ancestry back to a different archetype than the "stereotyped" text in use before P^{46}'s discovery – it goes back to "a very different original draft" (p. 33). This book is also interesting because Hoskier, in places, reflects on his preferred method of textual criticism. For example, he emphasises patient tedium and labour: "I commend this to any who still think there may be some short cuts to be had in textual criticism. Let this disabuse them. Indeed, there is no road at all, from where we stand, but a tangled brush. No coach and four may gallop up to it; no high-powered modern car may purr up alongside it, but the Shrine, which houses the remains of our titledeeds – the Δαβίρ, the Oracle – is plainly visible" (p. 67). The book closes (pp. 74–6) with an esoteric aside, unrelated from his preceding analysis, which attempts to connect Hoskier's academic work to his philosophical ideals, even citing his own *In Tune with the Universe*. Hoskier is as much a philologist of the New Testament as he is a philologist of the beyond.[82]

[82] Cf. his analysis of Patience Worth's spirit communications, noting also "to us, who study the comparative value of messages from beyond…" (DA21/1/2/1/25/5).

Author´s e-offprint with publisher´s permission